



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APM

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/535,831   | 03/28/2000  | Yoram Ofek           | SYN 1756            | 5043             |
| 20787  | 7590        | 08/09/2004           | EXAMINER            |                  |
| SITRICK & SITRICK<br>8340 N LINCOLN AVENUE SUITE 201<br>SKOKIE, IL 60077 |             |                      | LEVITAN, DMITRY     |                  |
|  |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|  |             |                      | 2662                | 15               |
| DATE MAILED: 08/09/2004  |             |                      |                     |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                        |                 |              |
|------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>Advisory Action</b> | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|                        | 09/535,831      | OFEK ET AL.  |
| Examiner               | Art Unit        |              |
| Dmitry Levitan         | 2662            |              |

***1. The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --***

THE REPLY FILED 03 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).


Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).


1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.  
 2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:  
 (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);  
 (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.


NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.


3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
 4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
 5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_.  
 6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  
 7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.


The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:


Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_. 

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_. 

Claim(s) rejected: 21-52,54-67,82-86 and 89-91. 

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_. 

8.  The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
 9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_. 

10.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_. 

**HASSAN KIZOU**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**

**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Continuation of 2. NOTE: The amendment to the specification raises new issue concerning the inventorship under 102f.

Claiming priority to Dr. Ofek patent basically implies that Mr. Baldi is not the inventor of the claimed invention, since the invention is fully disclosed and anticipated by the patent to Dr. Ofek to which Mr. Baldi had no contribution.

In other words, Dr. Ofek is a sole inventor of the mentioned parent application/patent including all claims. This continuation-in-part is fully anticipated by the parent application/patent and raise a question of the contribution of the second author to the invention. Examiner believes that the inventorship problem is not resolved, because the outcome of the petition for correcting inventorship in US 6,272,131 is unknown.